UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,742	02/11/2004	Ronald S. Cok	001444-0000	3604

9629 7590 04/26/2011

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP (WA)
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER	
RAABE, CHRISTOPHER M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2879	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/26/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/776,742	COK, RONALD S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHRISTOPHER M. RAABE	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 February 2011*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's submission, filed 10 February 2011, has been entered and acknowledged by the examiner.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections of the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17,20-26,29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panerai et al. (USPN 3393337) in view of Iwanaga et al. (USPN 5710484) and Appelberg (USPN 5045755).

With regard to claim 1,

Panerai et al. disclose in at least the figures and column 1, lines 30-40 a method for providing a replaceable light source comprising the steps of: manufacturing a light source by depositing a single flexible light emitting diode layer, being a single continuous light emitting element including two electrodes (78,80), at least one of which is transparent, on a single flat, flexible two dimensional substrate (76) in a substantially two-dimensional configuration; and

flexing and removably placing the light source in a curved three dimensional configuration within a lighting fixture.

While Panerai et al. do not disclose the method of shipping the light source, it was a well known and widely used practice to those of ordinary skill in the art to ship a two-dimensional product in a two dimensional configuration to simplify packing, and therefore would have been obvious to the same.

Additionally, while Panerai et al. do not disclose the area emitting light source having a flexible organic light emitting diode layer on a single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate, the diode layer including two electrodes, at least one of the electrodes being transparent, Iwanaga et al. does disclose in at least example 1 an analogous light source having a flexible organic light emitting diode layer on a single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate, the diode layer including two electrodes, at least one of the electrodes being transparent, reducing required driving voltage. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the light source of Iwanaga et al. into the method of Panerai et al. in order to reduce driving voltage. While Panerai et al. do not disclose a tab portion and step portion, Appelberg does disclose in at least figure 18, a tab and step portion (304,400) allowing for quick, convenient connection and disconnection of the light source. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the tab and step portion of Appelberg into the light source of Panerai et al.

With regard to claim 2,

Panerai et al. disclose the method claimed in claim 1. While Panerai et al. do not disclose the package used in shipping, it was a well known and widely used practice to pack a

substantially two dimensional object in a flat package to save space while protecting the product during shipping, and therefore would have been obvious to the same.

With regard to claim 3,

Panerai et al. disclose the method claimed in claim 2. While Panerai et al. do not disclose the shipping method, Panerai et al. do disclose producing a plurality of sources and the end user utilizing the plurality of sources, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to ship the product in a package containing a plurality of light sources in order to reduce shipping costs.

With regard to claim 4,

Panerai et al. disclose the method claimed in claim 3, wherein a portion of the plurality of light sources may be removed from a package.

With regard to claim 5,

Panerai et al. disclose the method claimed in claim 2 wherein the light source may be removed from a package and mounted in the lighting fixture by holding and manipulating the light source by the edges of the light source.

With regard to claim 17,

Panerai et al. disclose in at least the figures and column 1, lines 30-40 a method for providing a replaceable light source comprising the steps of: manufacturing a plurality of light sources by fore each area light emitting light source depositing a single flexible light emitting diode layer (79) being a single continuous light emitting element including two electrodes

(78,80) on a single flat, flexible substrates (76) in substantially two-dimensional configurations; forming a sequentially attached plurality of the light sources into a cylindrical roll; detaching one or more of the light sources from the roll; and flexing and removably placing the detached light source in a curved three dimensional configuration within a lighting fixture.

While Panerai et al. do not disclose shipping the roll of light sources, this practice was well known to and widely used by those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a product to a customer, and therefore would have been obvious to the same.

Additionally, while Panerai et al. do not disclose the area emitting light source having a flexible organic light emitting diode layer on a single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate, the diode layer including two electrodes, at least one of the electrodes being transparent, Iwanaga et al. does disclose in at least example 1 an analogous light source having a flexible organic light emitting diode layer on a single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate, the diode layer including two electrodes, at least one of the electrodes being transparent, reducing driving voltage. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the light source of Iwanaga et al. into the method of Panerai et al. in order to reduce driving voltage. While Panerai et al. do not disclose a tab portion and step portion, Appelberg does disclose in at least figure 18, a tab and step portion (304,400) allowing for quick, convenient connection and disconnection of the light source. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the tab and step portion of Appelberg into the light source of Panerai et al.

With regard to claim 26,

Panerai et al. disclose in at least the figures and column 1, lines 30-40 a method for providing a replaceable light source comprising the steps of: manufacturing a plurality of light

sources by, for each area illumination emitting light source depositing a single flexible light emitting diode layer (79) being a single continuous light emitting element including two electrodes (78,80), at least one of which is transparent on a single flat, flexible substrate (76) in substantially two-dimensional configurations; forming a sequentially attached plurality of the light sources into a stack; detaching one or more of the light sources from the stack; and flexing and removably placing the detached light source in a curved three dimensional configuration within a lighting fixture.

While Panerai et al. do not disclose the stack to be accordion-folded, nor shipping the light sources, forming an accordion-folded stack from a substantially two-dimensional flexible product was a practice well known to and widely used by those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a more compact product for packaging and therefore would have been obvious to the same. Additionally shipping a product was a practice well known to and widely used by those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a product to a customer, and therefore would have been obvious to the same.

Additionally, while Panerai et al. do not disclose the area emitting light source having a flexible organic light emitting diode layer on a single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate, the diode layer including two electrodes, at least one of the electrodes being transparent, Iwanaga et al. does disclose in at least example 1 an analogous light source having a flexible organic light emitting diode layer on a single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate, the diode layer including two electrodes, at least one of the electrodes being transparent, reducing driving voltage. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the light source of Iwanaga et al. into the method of Panerai et al. in order to reduce driving voltage. While Panerai et al. do not disclose a tab portion and step portion, Appelberg does disclose in at least figure 18, a tab and step portion (304,400) allowing for

quick, convenient connection and disconnection of the light source. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the tab and step portion of Appelberg into the light source of Panerai et al.

With regard to claims 20,21,29,30,

Panerai et al. disclose the method claimed in claim 17 and 26, wherein the sequential attachment is provided by a common flexible substrate/backing layer (76).

With regard to claims 6-16, 22-25, 31-34,

Panerai et al. disclose the method of claim 1, 17, and 26. While Panerai et al. do not disclose providing a package (the obviousness of this was addressed in the rejection of claim 2) the method of distribution (vending machine or mail-order) or the method of inducing sale (providing a separable plurality of individual products with a dispenser, packaging separate components together, ostensibly offering one of the components free with purchase of the other, advertising, providing a testable product, inducing repeat business via customer deposit), these practices were well known to and widely used by those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to increase sales and therefore would have been obvious to the same.

With regard to claim 35,

Panerai et al. disclose in at least the figures and column 1, lines 30-40 a method for providing a replaceable light source comprising the steps of: manufacturing a light source by depositing one or more layers of light emitting materials (79) between two electrodes (78,80) each of the one or more layers being a single continuous light emitting element, on a single

flat, flexible substrate (76) having a flexible encapsulating cover (81) affixed to the flat flexible substrate (76), in a substantially two-dimensional configuration; and flexing and removably placing the light source in a curved three dimensional configuration within a lighting fixture.

While Panerai et al. do not disclose the method of shipping the light source, it was a well known and widely used practice to those of ordinary skill in the art to ship a two-dimensional product in a two dimensional configuration to simplify packing, and therefore would have been obvious to the same.

Additionally, while Panerai et al. do not disclose the area emitting light source having a flexible organic light emitting diode layer on a single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate, the diode layer including two electrodes, at least one of the electrodes being transparent, Iwanaga et al. does disclose in at least column 1 an analogous light source having a flexible organic light emitting diode layer on a single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate, the diode layer including two electrodes, at least one of the electrodes being transparent, reducing driving voltage. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the light source of Iwanaga et al. into the method of Panerai et al. in order to reduce driving voltage. While Panerai et al. do not disclose a tab portion and step portion, Appelberg does disclose in at least figure 18, a tab and step portion (304,400) allowing for quick, convenient connection and disconnection of the light source. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the tab and step portion of Appelberg into the light source of Panerai et al.

Claims 18,19,27,28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panerai et al., Appelberg, and Iwanaga et al. (as above) in view of Atchinson et al. (USPN 6371637).

With regard to claims 18,19,27,28,

Panerai et al. disclose the method of claims 17 and 26, while not disclosing the arrangement of the plurality of light sources, Atchinson et al. disclose additionally in column 9, lines 10-20, further comprising the step of providing a plurality of light sources packaged in a roll (stack) and electrically connected in parallel and means to detach and provide power to groups of individual light sources electrically connected in parallel (series), allowing the customizing of the source. It would therefore have been obvious to incorporate the configuration of Atchinson et al. into the method of Panerai et al.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER M. RAABE whose telephone number is (571)272-8434. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on 571-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Peter J Macchiarolo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2879

/CR/